DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 013 TM 820 095

AUTHOR Lord, Frederic M.
TITLE Unbiased Estimators of Ability Parameters, of Their Variance, and of Their Parallel-Forms Reliability.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Naval Research, Arlington, Va. Personnel and Training Research Programs Office.
REPORT NO ETS-RR-81-50
PUB DATE Nov 81
CONTRACT N00014-80-C-0402
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Estimation (Mathematics); *Latent Trait Theory; Mathematical Formulas; *Maximum Likelihood Statistics; Scores; *Statistical Bias
IDENTIFIERS *Ability Parameters; *Item Parameters

ABSTRACT

This paper is primarily concerned with determining the statistical bias in the maximum likelihood estimate of the examinee ability parameter in item response theory, and of certain functions of such parameters. Given known item parameters, unbiased estimators are derived for (1) an examinee's ability parameter and proportion-correct true score; (2) the variance of ability parameters across examinees in the group tested, and the variance of proportion-correct true scores; and (3) the parallel-forms reliability of the observed test score, the maximum likelihood estimator. These formulas apply in situations where the item parameters are known; they are not adequate for situations where the item parameters and ability parameters are estimated simultaneously from a single data set. (Author/BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216013

UNBIASED ESTIMATORS OF ABILITY PARAMETERS, OF THEIR VARIANCE, AND OF THEIR PARALLEL-FORMS RELIABILITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

the Office of Naval Research

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Frederic M. Lord

This research was sponsored in part by the Personnel and Training Research Programs Psychological Sciences Division Office of Naval Research, under Contract No. N00014-80-C-0402

Contract Authority Identification Number NR No. 150-453

Frederic M. Lord, Principal Investigator

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

November 1981

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

TM 820 055

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Unbiased Estimators of Ability Parameters, of Their Variance, and of Their Parallel-Forms Reliability		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER Research Report 81-50
7. AUTHOR(s) Frederic M. Lord		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-80-C-0402
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08541		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 150-453
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458)		12. REPORT DATE November 1981 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 29
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Bias (statistical), Estimation, Item Response Theory, Ability, True Score, Reliability, Maximum Likelihood, Mental Test Theory, Unbiased Estimate, Standard Error, Asymptotics

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Given known item parameters, unbiased estimators are derived 1) for an examinee's ability parameter θ and for his proportion-correct true score ζ, 2) for s^2_θ the variance of θ across examinees in the group tested, also for s^2_ζ, and 3) for the parallel-forms reliability of the observed test score, the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}$.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Abstract

Given known item parameters, unbiased estimators are derived 1) for an examinee's ability parameter θ and for his proportion-correct true score ζ, 2) for s^2_θ the variance of θ across examinees in the group tested, also for s^2_ζ, and 3) for the parallel-forms reliability of the observed test score, the maximum likelihood estimator, $\hat{\theta}$.

Unbiased Estimators of Ability Parameters, of Their Variance, and of Their Parallel-Forms Reliability

This paper is primarily concerned with determining the statistical bias in the maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of the examinee ability parameter θ in item response theory (IRT) [Lord, 1980]; also of certain functions of such parameters. We will deal only with unidimensional tests composed of dichotomously scored items. We assume the item response function is three-parameter logistic (2).

Available results for the sampling variance of $\hat{\theta}$ are currently limited to the case where the item parameters are known; the present derivations are limited to this case also. This limitation is tolerable in situations where the item parameters are predetermined, as in item banking and tailored testing.

In the absence of a prior distribution for θ, it is well known that examinees with perfect scores have $\hat{\theta} = \infty$; also that examinees who perform near or below the chance level on multiple-choice items may be given large negative values of $\hat{\theta}$. This (correctly) suggests that $\hat{\theta}$ is positively biased for high-ability examinees and negatively biased for low-ability examinees. Will a correction of $\hat{\theta}$ for bias be helpful in such cases?

---

*This work was supported in part by contract N00014-80-C-0402, project designation NR 150-453 between the Office of Naval Research and Educational Testing Service. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

It is also 'well known' that for any ordinary group of examinees, the variance ($s^2_{\hat{\theta}}$) of $\hat{\theta}$ across examinees is larger than the variance (s^2_{θ}) of the true θ . The ratio $s^2_{\hat{\theta}}/s^2_{\theta}$ is closely related to the classical-test-theory reliability of $\hat{\theta}$ considered as the examinee's test score. Thus it is not enough for us to know that $s^2_{\hat{\theta}} \to s^2_{\theta}$ as the number n of test items becomes large; we need to know how the relation of $s^2_{\hat{\theta}}$ to s^2_{θ} varies as a function of n . We also need a better estimate of s^2_{θ} than its maximum-likelihood estimator $s^2_{\hat{\theta}}$. These objectives can be achieved by correcting $s^2_{\hat{\theta}}$ for bias.

The methods used to derive formulas for correction for bias are presented here in detail for at least two reasons: 1) experience with similar derivations has shown that it is easy to reach erroneous results if details are not spelled out. 2) The general methods used here are easily transferred to solve other problems, such as a) correction of item parameters for bias, b) obtaining higher-order approximations to the sampling variance of $\hat{\theta}$.

1. Statistical Bias in $\hat{\theta}$ and $\hat{\zeta}$

The method used here to find the bias of $\hat{\theta}$ is adapted from the 'adjusted order of magnitude' procedure detailed by Shenton and Bowman (1977). They assume their data to be a sample from a population divided into a denumerable number of subsets. For them, the population proportion of observations in a given subset is a known function of the parameter θ whose value they wish to estimate. Their sample estimate of θ is therefore a function of observed sample proportions in the

various subsets. Since our data do not readily fit this picture, we cannot use their final published formulas but must instead derive our own.

Throughout Section 1, we deal with a single fixed examinee whose ability θ is the parameter to be estimated. All item parameters are assumed known.

1.1 Preliminaries

The maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\theta}$ is obtained by solving the likelihood equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} (u_i - \hat{P}_i)\hat{P}_i'/\hat{P}_i\hat{Q}_i = 0 \qquad (1)$$

where $u_i = 0$ or 1 is the examinee's response to item i ($i = 1,2,\ldots,$ n), $P_i \equiv P_i(\theta)$ is the response function for item i, $Q_i \equiv 1 - P_i$, P_i' is the derivative of P_i with respect to θ, and a caret indicates that the function is to be evaluated at $\hat{\theta}$. We deal with the case where P_i is the three-parameter logistic function

$$P_i \equiv c_i + \frac{1 - c_i}{1 + e^{-A_i(\theta - b_i)}} \qquad (2)$$

where A_i, b_i, and c_i are item parameters describing item i.

We will assume

1. θ is a bounded variable,

2. the item parameters a_i and b_i are bounded,

3. c_i is bounded away from 1,

(thus P_i and Q_i are bounded away from 0 and 1);

4. as n becomes large, the statistical characteristics of the test stabilize.

Rather than trying to define this last assumption formally, the reader may substitute the more restrictive assumption usually made in mental test theory: that a test is lengthened by adding strictly parallel forms.

With these assumptions, the conditions of Bradley and Gart (1962) are satisfied. It follows from their theorems that $\hat{\theta}$ is a consistent estimator of θ and that $\sqrt{n}\,(\hat{\theta} - \theta)$ is asymptotically normally distributed with mean zero and variance $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \Sigma_i^n P_i'^2/P_iQ_i$. The existence of this limit is guaranteed by assumption 4.

For compactness, we will rewrite (1) as

$$\hat{L}_1 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{r}_{1i} = 0 \quad , \tag{3}$$

where by definition

$$\Gamma_{1i} \equiv (u_i - P_i)P_i'/P_iQ_i \quad . \tag{4}$$

Now $\hat{L}_1$ considered as a function of $\hat{\theta}$ can be expanded formally in powers of $\hat{\theta} - \theta$, as follows:

$$\hat{L}_1 \equiv \sum_i \Gamma_{1i} + (\hat{\theta} - \theta) \sum_i \Gamma_{2i} + \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\theta} - \theta)^2 \sum_i \Gamma_{3i} + \cdots$$

where we define

$$\Gamma_{si} \equiv \frac{d^s}{d\theta^s} \log P_i^{u_i} Q_i^{1-u_i} \qquad (s = 1,2,\ldots) \quad . \tag{5}$$

This definition is consistent with (3).

Let $x \equiv \hat{\theta} - \theta$, $\Gamma_s \equiv \sum_i \Gamma_{si}$. Rather than proving the convergence of the power series, let us use a closed form that is always valid:

$$\hat{L}_1 \equiv \Gamma_1 + x\Gamma_2 + \frac{1}{2} x^2\Gamma_3 + \frac{1}{6} x^3\Gamma_4 + \frac{\delta}{24} x^4\bar{\Gamma}_5 \tag{6}$$

where $\bar{\Gamma}_5 \equiv \operatorname{Max}_\theta \Gamma_5$ and $|\delta| < 1$.

1.2 Derivatives and Expectations

To proceed further, it is necessary to evaluate the Γ_{ki}. It is found that

$$\Gamma_{ki} = (-A_i)^{k-1} \frac{P_i'}{Q_i} \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} s! \mathcal{G}_{k-1}^{s} \left(\frac{-Q_i}{1 - c_i} \right)^s \left(-1 + \frac{u_i c_i^s}{P_i^{s+1}} \right) \qquad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{k-1}^{s}$ is a Stirling number of the second kind (Jordan, 1947, pp. 31-32, 168).

Define

$$\gamma_{si} \equiv \delta\Gamma_{si} \quad , \qquad (8)$$

$$\varepsilon_{si} \equiv \Gamma_{si} - \delta\Gamma_{si} \quad . \qquad (9)$$

Since $\delta u_i = P_i$, we find that

$$\gamma_{1i} = 0 \quad , \qquad (10)$$

$$\gamma_{2i} = -\frac{P_i'^2}{P_i Q_i} \quad , \qquad (11)$$

$$\gamma_{3i} = \frac{A_i^2}{(1 - c_i)^2} \frac{P_i'}{P_i^2} (P_i - c_i)[2(P_i^2 - c_i) - P_i(1 - c_i)] \quad , \qquad (12)$$

$$\varepsilon_{1i} = \Gamma_{1i} = (u_i - P_i)P_i'/P_i Q_i \quad , \qquad (13)$$

$$\varepsilon_{2i} = \frac{A_i c_i}{(1 - c_i)} \frac{P_i'(u_i - P_i)}{P_i^2} \quad . \qquad (14)$$

Let

$$\gamma_s = \sum_i \gamma_{si}/n \quad , \quad \varepsilon_s \equiv \sum_i \varepsilon_{si}/n \quad . \qquad (15)$$

We will denote the Fisher information by

$$I \equiv -\mathcal{E}(dL_1/d\theta) = -n\gamma_2 = \sum_i P_i'^2/P_iQ_i \quad . \tag{16}$$

Setting (6) equal to zero, the likelihood equation can now be written in terms of the γ_s and the ε_s as

$$-\varepsilon_1 = x(\gamma_2 + \varepsilon_2) + \frac{1}{2}x^2(\gamma_3 + \varepsilon_3) + \frac{1}{6}x^3(\gamma_4 + \varepsilon_4) + \frac{\delta}{24}x^4T_5 \quad . \tag{17}$$

We will need some information about the order of magnitude of the terms such as those in (17). It may be seen from (7) that each ε_s has the form

$$\varepsilon_s = \frac{1}{n}\sum_i K_{si}(u_i - P_i)$$

where K_{si} does not depend on n or on u_i. Since P_i, Q_i and $1 - c_i$ are bounded, the K_{si} and thus ε_s is bounded. By assumption (4), the bound does not depend on n. The same conclusion holds for γ_s.

Since $\sqrt{n}\,x$ is asymptotically normally distributed with zero mean and finite variance, it follows that $\mathcal{E}x^r$ ($r = 1,2,\ldots$) is of order $n^{-r/2}$. A similar statement is true of $\sqrt{n}\,\varepsilon_s$. Thus finally $\mathcal{E}x^r\varepsilon_s^t \leq (\mathcal{E}x^{2r}\mathcal{E}_s^{2t})^{1/2}$ so that $\mathcal{E}x^r\varepsilon_s^t$ is of order $n^{-(r+t)/2}$ ($r,t = 1,2,\ldots$).

1.3 First-Order Variance of $\hat{\theta}$

To clarify the procedure, let us derive from (17) the familiar formula for the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\theta}$. Square (17) and take expectations to obtain

$$\mathcal{E}\varepsilon_1^2 = \gamma_2^2 \mathcal{E} x^2 + 2\gamma_2 \mathcal{E} x^2 \varepsilon_2 + \mathcal{E} x^2 \varepsilon_2^2 + \gamma_2\gamma_3 \mathcal{E} x^3 + \gamma_2 \mathcal{E}\varepsilon_3 x^3 + \dots \quad . \tag{18}$$

If we wish to neglect terms $o(n^{-1})$ (of higher order than n^{-1}). equation (18) becomes

$$\mathcal{E} x^2 = \frac{1}{\gamma_2^2} \mathcal{E}\varepsilon_1^2 + o(n^{-1}) \quad . \tag{19}$$

By (13) and (16), because of local independence,

$$\mathcal{E}\varepsilon_1^2 = \mathcal{E} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_i \frac{P_i'}{P_i Q_i} (u_i - P_i) \sum_j \frac{P_j'}{P_j Q_j} (u_j - P_j)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_i \sum_j \frac{P_i' P_i'}{P_i Q_i P_j Q_j} \mathcal{E}(u_i - P_i)(u_i - P_j)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_i \frac{P_i'^2}{P_i^2 Q_i^2} \operatorname{Var} u_i$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_i \frac{P_i'^2}{P_i Q_i}$$

$$= \frac{I}{n^2} \quad . \tag{20}$$

Thus, finally

$$\text{Var } \hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{I} + o(n^{-1}) \quad , \tag{21}$$

a well-known result. It is derived here to clarify the reasoning to be used subsequently. If $\hat{\theta}$ is substituted for θ on the right side of (21), the formula will still be correct to the specified order of approximation.

1.4 Statistical Bias of $\hat{\theta}$

Take the expectation of (17) to obtain

$$-\delta_1\varepsilon_1 = \gamma_2\delta_1 x + \delta_1 x\varepsilon_2 + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_3\delta_1 x^2 \quad , \tag{22}$$

where δ_1 indicates an expectation in which only terms of order n^{-1} are to be retained. Also multiply (17) by ε_2 and take expectations to obtain

$$-\delta_1\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 = \gamma_2\delta_1 x\varepsilon_2 \quad . \tag{23}$$

By (9)

$$\delta\varepsilon_r = 0 \qquad r = 1,2,\ldots \quad . \tag{24}$$

From (13) and (14)

$$\delta\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_i \frac{A_i c_i}{1-c_i}\frac{P_i'^2}{P_i^3 Q_i}\delta(u_i - P_i)^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_i \frac{A_i c_i}{(1-c_i)}\frac{P_i'^2}{P_i^2} \quad . \tag{25}$$

Substituting (16) and (25) into (23), we have the covariance

$$\delta_1 x\varepsilon_2 = \frac{1}{nI}\sum_i \frac{A_i c_i}{(1-c_i)}\frac{P_i'^2}{P_i^2} \quad . \tag{26}$$

Finally, substituting (16), (21), (24), and (26) into (22) and solving for $\delta_1 x_1$, we have the bias

$$B_1(\hat{\theta}) \equiv \delta_1(\hat{\theta} - \theta) = \frac{1}{I^2}\left(\sum_i \frac{A_i c_i}{1-c_i}\frac{P_i'^2}{P_i^2} + \frac{1}{2}m\gamma_3\right) \quad . \tag{27}$$

This may be rewritten as

$$B_1(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{I^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i I_i(\phi_i - \tfrac{1}{2}) \tag{28}$$

where

$$\phi_i \equiv \frac{P_i - c_i}{1-c_i} \quad \text{and} \quad I_i \equiv \frac{P_i'^2}{P_i Q_i} \quad . \tag{29}$$

Since I is of order n, $B_1(\hat{\theta})$ is of order n^{-1}. It may be of interest to note that in the special case where all items are equivalent (all P_i are the same), the bias simplifies to $B_1(\hat{\theta}) = P/nP'$.

1.5 Numerical Results

A hypothetical test was designed to approximate the College Entrance Examination Board's Scholastic Aptitude Test, Verbal Section. This test is composed of $n = 90$ five-choice items. Some information about the distributions of the parameters of the 90 hypothetical items is given in Table 1.

The standard error and bias of $\hat{\theta}$ were computed from (21) and from (27) respectively for various values of θ. The results are shown in Table 2. It appears that the bias in $\hat{\theta}$ is negligible for moderate values of θ, but is sizable for extreme values. Note that the bias is positively correlated with θ. Because of guessing, zero bias does not occur at $\theta = 0$ but at $\theta = .34$ approximately.

1.6 Variance and Bias of Estimated True Score

Since the ability scale is not unique, any monotonic transformation of θ can serve as a measure of ability. Two transformations are particularly useful: e^{θ} and

$$\zeta \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i(\theta) \quad , \tag{30}$$

the proportion-correct true score (the number-right true score divided

TABLE 1

Range and Quartiles of the Item Parameters
in 90-Item Hypothetical Test

	$a_i \equiv A_i/1.7$	b_i	c_i
Highest value	1.88	2.32	.47
Q_1	1.07	1.15	.20
Median	.83	.38	.15
Q_3	.69	-.41	.13
Lowest value	.41	-3.94	.01

by the number of items). One important reason for using the latter transformation is the following.

Ordinarily, as in Table 2, we find large standard errors of $\hat{\theta}$ where θ is extreme. Usually these large standard errors are no more harmful to the user than are the smaller standard errors found when θ is near the level aimed at by the test. There is a reason why this is so: If it were not, the user should have designed his test so as to reduce those standard errors that were troublesome to him.

We see that from this point of view the size of a difference on the θ scale does not correspond to its importance. The discrepancy is greatly reduced, however, if we measure ability on the ζ scale instead of on the θ scale. This is one reason, among several, why we are interested in the variance and bias of

$$\hat{\zeta} \equiv \Sigma_i P_i(\hat{\theta})/n \quad . \tag{31}$$

Although the proportion-correct true score

$$z \equiv \Sigma_i u_i/n \tag{32}$$

is an unbiased estimator of ζ, z is never a fully efficient estimator of ζ unless $c_i = 0$ and $a_i = a_j$ ($i,j = 1,2,\ldots,n$): the sampling variance

$$\text{Var } z = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i Q_i \tag{33}$$

TABLE 2

Standard Error and Statistical Bias in $\hat{\theta}$

$\hat{\theta}$	$\sqrt{\text{Var}\ \hat{\theta}}$	$B(\hat{\theta})$
3.5	.60	.24
3.0	.43	.12
2.5	.31	.06
2.0	.23	.032
1.5	.19	.011
1.0	.19	.0032
0.5	.20	.0012
0	.22	-.0028
-0.5	.25	-.010
-1.0	.31	-.025
-1.5	.41	-.05
-2.0	.54	-.09
-2.5	.70	-.14
-3.0	.89	-.22
-3.5	1.09	-.31

is not as small as the sampling variance of $\hat{\zeta}$, which we must now derive.

By (31)

$$d\hat{\zeta} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{P}_i' d\hat{\theta} \quad . \tag{34}$$

Using the 'delta' method

$$\text{Var } \hat{\zeta} = \frac{1}{n^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i' \right)^2 \text{Var } \hat{\theta} \quad .$$

By (21) and (16)

$$\text{Var } \hat{\zeta} = \frac{\left(\sum_i P_i' \right)^2}{n^2 \sum_i \frac{P_i'^2}{P_i Q_i}} \quad . \tag{35}$$

To find the bias of $\hat{\zeta}$, we expand it in powers of $x \equiv \theta - \hat{\theta}$:

$$\hat{\zeta} - \zeta \equiv \frac{x}{n} \Sigma P_i' + \frac{x^2}{2n} \Sigma P_i'' + \ldots \tag{36}$$

where

$$P_i'' \equiv d^2P_i/d\theta^2 \quad .$$

Taking expectations, and neglecting higher-order terms, we have for the bias

$$B_1(\hat{\zeta}) \equiv \mathcal{E}(\hat{\zeta} - \zeta) = \frac{1}{n}\left[B(\hat{\theta})\ \Sigma P_i' + \frac{1}{2}\ \mathrm{Var}\ \hat{\theta}(\Sigma P_i'')\right] \quad . \tag{37}$$

This can be rewritten as

$$B_1(\hat{\zeta}) = \frac{\zeta'}{I^2}\left(\Sigma\ \frac{A_i c_i P_i'^2}{(1 - c_i)P_i^2} + \frac{1}{2}\ \Sigma_i\ \gamma_{3i}\right) + \frac{\zeta''}{2I} \tag{38}$$

where $\zeta' \equiv \Sigma_i P_i'/n$ and $\zeta'' \equiv \Sigma_i P_i''/n$. Let us note is passing that when all items are equivalent (all $P_i(\theta)$ are the same), $\hat{\zeta} = z$ and its bias (38) is zero.

1.7 Numerical Results

Table 3 shows the bias in $\hat{\zeta}$ for the same hypothetical test considered in Section 1.5. The biases are all positive. However, they are negligible at all except the lowest ability levels. This tends to confirm our choice of the ζ scale of ability rather than the θ scale for many purposes.

TABLE 3

Standard Error of z and of $\hat{\zeta}$, and Statistical Bias of $\hat{\zeta}$

$\hat{\theta}$	$\hat{\zeta}$	$\sqrt{\text{Var } z}$	$\sqrt{\text{Var } \hat{\zeta}}$	$B(\hat{\zeta})$
3.5	.981	.014	.014	.00045
3.0	.966	.019	.018	.00052
2.5	.937	.024	.023	.00064
2.0	.891	.031	.029	.00059
1.5	.812	.037	.035	.00021
1.0	.715	.042	.040	.00026
0.5	.608	.045	.042	.00061
0	.506	.046	.043	.00061
-0.5	.416	.047	.042	.00062
-1.0	.344	.046	.038	.00061
-1.5	.291	.045	.037	.00085
-2.0	.254	.044	.033	.0014
-2.5	.227	.042	.029	.0020
-3.0	.211	.042	.025	.0024
-3.5	.199	.041	.021	.0026

As a matter of incidental interest, for selected values of true score Table 3 compares the standard error (35) of the maximum-likelihood estimator $\hat{\zeta}$ with the standard error (33) of the unbiased estimator z (proportion-correct score). There is little difference in accuracy between the two estimators for $\zeta \geq .5$. At low true-score levels, the maximum-likelihood estimator is much better than the proportion of correct answers.

2. Unbiased Estimation of s_θ^2, of s_ζ^2; Test Reliability

The symbols s_θ^2 and s_ζ^2 are used for the sample variance of θ and of ζ across the N examinees in the sample:

$$s_\theta^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \theta_a^2 - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \theta_a \right)^2 \quad . \tag{39}$$

The maximum-likelihood estimators of s_θ^2 and s_ζ^2 are $s_{\hat{\theta}}^2$ and $s_{\hat{\zeta}}^2$, the sample variances across examinees of $\hat{\theta}$ and of $\hat{\zeta}$.

2.1 Asymptotically Unbiased Estimator of σ_θ^2

Assume that our examinees are a random sample of N from some population. Denote by σ_θ^2 the population variance of θ. Then $Ns_\theta^2/(N-1)$ is an unbiased estimator of σ_θ^2. Since s_θ^2 is unobservable, our first task is to find a function of $\hat{\theta}$ that is an asymptotically unbiased estimator of σ_θ^2.

By the formula for the variance of a sum we have

$$\sigma^2_{\hat{\theta}} \equiv \sigma^2_{\theta+x} \equiv \sigma^2_{\theta} + \sigma^2_{x} + 2\sigma_{\theta x} \quad , \tag{40}$$

where σ^2 denotes a variance across all examinees in the population and $\sigma_{\theta x}$ is the corresponding population covariance. By a well-known identity from the analysis of variance

$$\sigma^2_{x} \equiv \mathcal{E}_{\theta}\sigma^2_{x|\theta} + \sigma^2_{\mathcal{E}(x|\theta)} \tag{41}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\theta}$ denotes an expectation across all examinees in the population. Similarly,

$$\sigma_{\theta x} \equiv \sigma_{\theta,\mathcal{E}(x|\theta)} \quad . \tag{42}$$

Substituting (41) and (42) into (40), transposing, writing $B_1 \equiv \mathcal{E}_1(x|\theta)$ as in (28), and dropping the subscript from B_1 for convenience, we have

$$\sigma^2_{\theta} \equiv \sigma^2_{\hat{\theta}} - 2\sigma_{\theta B} - \mathcal{E}_{\theta}\sigma^2_{x|\theta} - \sigma^2_{B} \quad . \tag{43}$$

Since by (28) B is of order n^{-1}, its variance is of order n^{-2}, so σ^2_B can be neglected in (43). Since Section 1 deals with a single fixed examinee, the symbol $\sigma^2_{x|\theta}$ in (43) has the same meaning as Var $\hat{\theta}$ in (21):

$$\sigma^2_{x|\theta} = \frac{1}{I(\theta)} + o(n^{-1})$$

where $I \equiv I(\theta)$ is given by (16). Since $\sigma^2_{x|\theta}$ is of order n^{-1}, the effect of replacing θ by $\hat{\theta}$ on the right is neglibible:

$$\delta_\theta \sigma^2_{x|\theta} = \delta_\theta \frac{1}{I(\hat{\theta})} + o(n^{-1}) \quad .$$

By similar reasoning, we may replace $\sigma_{\theta B}$ in (43) by $\sigma_{\hat{\theta}\hat{B}}$ where $\hat{B}$ is defined by (27) with θ replaced by $\hat{\theta}$. The result of these approximations is that

$$\sigma^2_\theta = \sigma^2_{\hat{\theta}} - 2\sigma_{\hat{\theta}\hat{B}} - \delta_\theta \frac{1}{I(\hat{\theta})} + o(n^{-1}) \quad . \tag{44}$$

A useful estimator of σ^2_θ can be calculated from

$$\hat{\sigma}^2_\theta \equiv \frac{N}{N-1} s^2_{\hat{\theta}} - \frac{2N}{N-1} s_{\hat{\theta}\hat{B}} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \frac{1}{I(\hat{\theta}_a)} \quad , \tag{45}$$

where

$$s_{\hat{\theta}\hat{B}} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \hat{\theta}_a \hat{B}_a - \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \hat{\theta}_a \right)\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \hat{B}_a \right)$$

and $\hat{B}_a$ is given by (27) with θ replaced by $\hat{\theta}_a$. If we wish to estimate the sample variance of ability s^2_θ rather than the population variance σ^2_θ, we can use

$$\hat{s}^2_\theta \equiv s^2_{\hat{\theta}} - 2s_{\hat{\theta}\hat{B}} - \frac{N-1}{N^2} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \frac{1}{I(\hat{\theta}_a)} \quad . \tag{46}$$

The second and third terms of (44) are of order n^{-1}, an order of magnitude smaller than the first term but larger than the neglected terms. The covariance of $\hat{\theta}$ and $\hat{B}$ is usually positive, as can be readily seen from Table 2. Since $I(\hat{\theta})$ is necessarily positive, it appears that usually $\sigma_{\theta}^2 < \sigma_{\hat{\theta}}^2$, an inequality that is frequently assumed without proof. It is not clear whether this inequality is necessarily true.

2.2 The Reliability of $\hat{\theta}$

Consider the parallel-forms reliability coefficient $\rho_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}'}$, the correlation between scores $\hat{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}'$ on two parallel tests. For present purposes, two tests are parallel when for each item in one test there is an item in the other test with the same item response function. Let us estimate

$$\rho_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}'} = \frac{\sigma_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}'}}{\sigma_{\hat{\theta}}\sigma_{\hat{\theta}'}} = \frac{\sigma_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}'}}{\sigma_{\hat{\theta}}^2} \tag{47}$$

from a single test administration by substituting asymptotically unbiased estimators of the numerator and of the denominator into (47).

As in (41),

$$\sigma_{\delta\hat{\theta}\delta\hat{\theta}'} \equiv \delta_{\theta}\sigma_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}'|\theta} + \sigma_{\delta(\hat{\theta}|\theta),\delta(\hat{\theta}'|\theta)} \quad . \tag{48}$$

Because of local independence, the first term on the right vanishes. Because of parallelism, the two expectations in the last term are identical, so this term is a variance. We thus have

$$\sigma_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}'} = \sigma^2_{\delta(\hat{\theta}|\theta)} \equiv \sigma^2_{B+\theta} = \sigma^2_B + \sigma^2_\theta + 2\sigma_{\theta B} \quad . \tag{49}$$

From (49) and (43),

$$\sigma_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}'} = \sigma^2_{\hat{\theta}} - \delta_\theta \sigma^2_{x|\theta} \quad . \tag{50}$$

We see that the parallel-forms reliability of $\hat{\theta}$ is

$$\rho_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}} = 1 - \frac{1}{\sigma^2_{\hat{\theta}}} \delta_\theta \frac{1}{I(\hat{\theta})} + o(n^{-1}) \quad . \tag{51}$$

Priority in obtaining this result belongs to Sympson [Note 1]. Replacing population values on the right by the corresponding sample statistics, we have a sample estimator of the parallel-forms reliability coefficient of $\hat{\theta}$:

$$\hat{\rho}_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}'} \equiv 1 - \frac{N-1}{N^2 s^2_{\hat{\theta}}} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \frac{1}{I(\hat{\theta}_a)} \quad . \tag{52}$$

Since θ is neither unbiased nor uncorrelated with θ , we should not expect the usual reliability formulas of classical test theory to apply. A similar but not identical case is discussed in

Lord and Novick (1968, Section 9.8). Thus $\rho_{\hat{\theta}\hat{\theta}'}$, $\rho^2_{\hat{\theta}\theta}$, and $\sigma^2_\theta/\sigma^2_{\hat{\theta}}$ are not interchangeable definitions of reliability. Since correlational measures are hard to interpret in the absence of linearity and homoscedasticity, we will not now push this investigation of reliability further.

2.3 Corresponding Results for True Score

By the same reasoning used to obtain (44) we have

$$\sigma^2_\zeta \equiv \sigma^2_{\hat{\zeta}} - 2\sigma_{\zeta,B(\hat{\zeta})} - \delta_\theta \sigma^2_{\hat{\zeta}|\zeta} - \sigma^2_{B(\hat{\zeta})}$$

$$= \sigma^2_{\hat{\zeta}} - 2\sigma_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{B}(\hat{\zeta})} - \delta_\theta \frac{\hat{\zeta}'^2}{I(\hat{\theta})} + o(n^{-1}) \quad . \tag{53}$$

A useful estimator of σ^2_ζ can be calculated from

$$\hat{\sigma}^2_\zeta \equiv \frac{N}{N-1} s^2_{\hat{\zeta}} - \frac{2N}{N-1} s_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{B}(\hat{\zeta})} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \frac{\hat{\zeta}'^2_a}{I(\hat{\theta}_a)} \quad . \tag{54}$$

To estimate s^2_ζ, we can use

$$\hat{s}^2_\zeta \equiv s^2_{\hat{\zeta}} - 2s_{\hat{\zeta},\hat{B}(\hat{\zeta})} - \frac{N-1}{N^2} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \frac{\hat{\zeta}'^2_a}{I(\hat{\theta}_a)} \quad . \tag{55}$$

As in (50) - (52) we have

$$\sigma_{\hat{\zeta}\hat{\zeta}'} = \sigma^2_{\hat{\zeta}} - \delta_\theta \sigma^2_{\hat{\zeta}|\zeta} \quad , \tag{56}$$

$$\rho_{\hat{\zeta}\hat{\zeta}'} = 1 - \frac{1}{\sigma^2_{\hat{\zeta}}} \delta_\theta \frac{\hat{\zeta}'^2}{I(\hat{\theta})} + o(n^{-1}) \quad , \tag{57}$$

$$\hat{\rho}_{\hat{\zeta}\hat{\zeta}'} \equiv 1 - \frac{N-1}{N^2 s^2_{\hat{\zeta}}} \sum_{a=1}^{N} \frac{\hat{\zeta}'^2}{I(\hat{\theta}_a)} \quad . \tag{58}$$

2.4 Numerical Results for True Scores

At moderate ability levels, (28) provides adequate but usually neglible corrections for bias in $\hat{\theta}$. Experience shows that at very low ability levels, the usual test length (n) of 50 or 100 items is not long enough for the asymptotic results of (28) to apply. For example, an examinee whose true θ is -3 may easily obtain an estimated ability $\hat{\theta}$ of -30 or of $-\infty$. For sufficiently long tests, such extreme values of $\hat{\theta}$ would have negligible probability, but with the usual values of n , equation (28) is totally inadequate for correcting $\hat{\theta}$ for bias at low ability levels.

This same difficulty carries over to the unbiased estimation of σ^2_θ using (46). Since all ability levels are involved in (46), the formula is useless in practice for any group that contains even a few low-ability examinees. Fortunately, this difficulty does not

carry over to the estimation of ability on the true-score (ζ) scale.

The hypothetical SAT Verbal Test of Tables 1-3 was administered to a typical group of 2995 hypothetical examinees. The bias in $\hat{\zeta}$ was estimated for each examinee and a corrected $\hat{\zeta}$ obtained from (51):

$$\text{corrected } \hat{\zeta} \equiv \hat{\zeta} - B_1(\hat{\zeta}) \quad .$$

In a few cases where the corrected $\hat{\zeta}$ would have been below the chance level $\Sigma_i^n c_i$, the corrected $\hat{\zeta}$ was set equal to $\Sigma_i^n c_i$.

The mean of the 2995 true ζ used to generate the data was .5280, the mean of the uncorrected $\hat{\zeta}$ was .5294, the mean of the corrected $\hat{\zeta}$ was .5288. Thus the correction was in the right direction, but not large enough. The uncorrected mean $\hat{\zeta}$ was already so accurate as to leave little room for improvement.

Next, (55) was used to estimate s_ζ. The true value was $s_\zeta = .1610$, the standard deviation of $\hat{\zeta}$ was $s_{\hat{\zeta}} = .1660$, the corrected estimate from (55) was $\hat{s}_\zeta = .1614$. The correction worked very well here.

The parallel-forms reliability of $\hat{\zeta}$ was estimated from (58) to be $\hat{\rho}_{\hat{\zeta}\hat{\zeta}'} = .9420$. We have no 'true' value against which this can be compared, but the estimate seems a reasonable one. The Kuder-Richardson formula-20 reliability of number-right scores for these data is .9275.

It should be remembered that both the formulas and the numerical results in this report apply in situations where the item parameters are known. These formulas may be satisfactory for situations where the item parameters have been estimated from large groups not containing the examinees whose ability estimates are to be corrected for bias. These formulas will not be adequate for situations where the item parameters and ability parameters are estimated simultaneously from a single data set.

Reference Note

1. Sympson, J. B. Estimating the reliability of adaptive tests from a single test administration. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

References

Bradley, R. A. & Gart, J. J. The asymptotic properties of ML estimators when sampling from associated populations. Biometrika, 1962, 49, 205-214.

Jordan, C. Calculus of finite differences (2nd ed.). New York: Chelsea, 1947.

Lord, F. M. Applications of item response theory to practical testing problems. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980.

Lord, F. M. & Novick, M. R. Statistical theories of mental test scores. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Shenton, L. R. & Bowman, K. O. Maximum likelihood estimation in small samples. Monograph No. 38. New York: Macmillan, 1977.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Navy

1 Dr. Ed Aiken
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Dr. Jack R. Borsting
Provost and Academic Dean
U.S. Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

1 Dr. Robert Breaux
Code N-711
NAVTRAEQUIPCEN
Orlando, FL 32813

1 Chief of Naval Education and
Training Liason Office
Air Force Human Resource Laboratory
Flying Training Division
Williams Air Force Base, AZ 85224

1 CDR Mike Curran
Office of Naval Research
800 North Quincy Street
Code 270
Arlington, VA 22217

1 Dr. Richard Elster
Department of Administrative Sciences
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

1 Dr. Pat Federico
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Mr. Paul Foley
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Dr. John Ford
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Dr. Patrick R. Harrison
Psychology Course Director
Leadership and Law Department (7b)
Division of Professional Development
U.S. Naval Academy
Annapolis, MD 21402

1 Dr. Norman J. Kerr
Chief of Naval Technical Training
Naval Air Station Memphis (75)
Millington, TN 38054

1 Dr. William L. Maloy
Principal Civilian Advisor for
Education and Training
Naval Training Command, Code 00A
Pensacola, FL 32508

1 Dr. Kneale Marshall
Scientific Advisor to DCNO(MPT)
Op01T
Washington, DC 20370

1 Dr. James McBride
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Dr. William Montague
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Mr. William Nordbrock
Instructional Program Development
Building 90
NET-PDCD
Great Lakes NTC, IL 60088

1 Library, Code P201L
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Technical Director
Navy Personnel R & D
San Diego, CA 92152

6 Commanding Officer
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 2627
Washington, DC 20390

1 Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
Building 114, Section D
666 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02210

1 Office of Naval Research
Code 437
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217

5 Personnel and Training Research Programs
Code 458
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217

1 Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
1030 East Green Street
Pasadena, CA 91101

1 Office of the Chief of Naval Operations
Research Development and Studies Branch
OP-115
Washington, DC 20350

1 LT Frank C. Petho, MSC, USN (Ph.D.)
Selection and Training Research Division
Human Performance Sciences Department
Naval Aerospace Medical Research Lab.
Pensacola, FL 32508

1 Dr. Bernard Rimland (03B)
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Mr. Arnold Rubenstein
Office of Naval Technology
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217

1 Dr. Worth Scanland, Director
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation
N-5
Naval Education and Training Command
NAS
Pensacola, FL 32508

1 Dr. Robert G. Smith
Office of Chief of Naval Operations
OP-987H
Washington, DC 20350

1 Dr. Alfred F. Smode
Training Analysis and Evaluation Group
Department of the Navy
Orlando, FL 32813

1 Dr. Richard Sorensen
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Mr. J. B. Sympson
Naval Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Dr. Ronald Weitzman
Code 54 WZ
Department of Administrative Services
U.S. Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

1 Dr. Robert Wherry
562 Hallard Drive
Chalfont, PA 18914

1 Dr. Robert Wisher
Code 309
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Dr. Martin F. Wiskoff
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

1 Mr. Ted M. I. Yellen
Technical Information Office
Code 201
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Army

1 Technical Director
U.S. Army Research Institute for the
Behavioral and Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

1 Dr. Myron Fischl
U.S. Army Research Institute for the
Social and Behavioral Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

1 Dr. Dexter Fletcher
U.S. Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

1 COL Frank Hart
Army Research Institute for the
Behavioral & Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Blvd.
Alexandria, VA 22333

1 Dr. Michael Kaplan
U.S. Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

1 Dr. Milton S. Katz
Training Technical Area
U.S. Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

1 Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr.
Attn: PERI-OK
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

1 Dr. Robert Sasmor
U.S. Army Research Institute for
the Social and Behavioral Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

1 Commandant
U.S. Army Institute of Administration
Attn: Dr. Sherrill
Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46256

1 Dr. Frederick Steinheiser
Department of the Navy
Chief of Naval Operations
OP-113
Washington, DC 20350

1 Dr. Joseph Ward
U.S. Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Air Force

1 Air Force Human Resources Laboratory
AFHRL/MPD
Brooks Air Force Base, TX 78235

1 U.S. Air Force Office of
Scientific Research
Life Sciences Directorate
Bolling Air Force Base
Washington, DC 20332

1 Air University Library
AUL/LSE 76/443
Maxwell Air Force Base, AL 36112

1 Dr. Earl A. Alluisi
HQ, AFHRL (AFSC)
Brooks Air Force Base, TX 78235

1 Mr. Raymond E. Christal
AFHRL/MO
Brooks Air Force Base TX 78235

1 Dr. Genevieve Haddad
Program Manager
Life Sciences Directorate
AFOSR
Bolling Air Force Base
Washington, DC 20332

1 Dr. Ross L. Morgan
AFHRL/LR
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

1 Research and Measurement Division
Research Branch, AFMPC/MPCYPR
Randolph Air Force Base, TX 78148

1 Dr. Malcolm Ree
AFHRL/MP
Brooks Air Force Base, TX 78235

1 Dr. Marty Rockway
Technical Director
AFHRL(OT)
Williams Air Force Base, AZ 58224

Marines

1 Dr. H. William Greenup
Education Advisor (E031)
Education Center, MCDEC
Quantico, VA 22134

1 Director, Office of Manpower Utilization
HQ, Marine Corps (MPU)
BCB, Building 2009
Quantico, VA 22134

1 MAJ Michael L. Patrow, USMC
Headquarters, Marine Corps
Code MPI-20
Washington, DC 20380

1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky
Scientific Advisor
Code RD-1
HQ, U.S. Marine Corps
Washington, DC 20380

Coast Guard

1 Mr. Thomas A. Warm
U.S. Coast Guard Institute
P.O. Substation 18
Oklahoma City, OK 73169

Other DoD

1 DARPA
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209

12 Defense Technical Information Center
Cameron Station, Building 5
Attn: TC
Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Dr. William Graham
Testing Directorate
MEPCOM/MEPCT-P
Ft. Sheridan, IL 60037

1 Military Assistant for Training
and Personnel Technology
Office of the Under Secretary of
Defense for Research and Engineering
Room 3D129, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

1 Dr. Wayne Sellman
Office of the Assistant Secretary
of Defense (MRAL)
2B269 The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

Civil Government

1 Dr. Susan Chipman
Learning and Development
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20208

1 Mr. Richard McKillip
Personnel R & D Center
Office of Personnel Management
1900 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20415

1 Dr. Arthur Melmed
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20208

1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar
Science Education Development
and Research
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550

1 Dr. Vern W. Urry
Personnel R & D Center
Office of Personnel Management
1900 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20415

1 Dr. Joseph L. Young, Director
Memory and Cognitive Processes
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550

Non-Government

1 Dr. Erling B. Andersen
Department of Statistics
Studiestraede 6
1455 Copenhagen
DENMARK

1 Psychological Research Unit
Department of Defense (Army Office)
Campbell Park Offices
Canberra, ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA

1 Dr. Alan Baddeley
Medical reserch Council
Applied Psychology Unit
15 Chaucer Road
Cambridge CB2 2EF
ENGLAND

1 Dr. Isaac Bejar
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

1 Dr. Menucha Birenbaum
School of Education
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv, Ramat Aviv 69978
ISRAEL

1 Dr. Werner Birke
DezWPs im Streitkraefteamt
Postfach 20 50 3
D-5300 Bonn 2
WEST GERMANY

1 Dr. R. Darrell Bock
Department of Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637

1 Liaison Scientists
Office of Naval Research
Branch Office, London
Box 39
FPO, NY 09510

1 Dr. Robert Brennan
American College Testing Programs
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52240

1 Dr. John B. Carroll
Psychometric Laboratory
University of North Carolina
Davie Hall 013A
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

1 Charles Myers Library
Livingstone House
Livingstone Road
Stratford
London E15 2LJ
ENGLAND

1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark
College of Arts and Sciences
University of Rochester
River Campus Station
Rochester, NY 14627

1 Dr. Norman Cliff
Department of Psychology
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007

1 Dr. William E. Coffman
Director, Iowa Testing Programs
334 Lindquist Center
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

1 Dr. Allan M. Collins
Bolt, Beranek, & Newman, Inc.
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

1 Dr. Meredith P. Crawford
American Psychological Association
1200 17th Street, N
Washington, DC 20036

1 Dr. Hans Crombag
Education Research Center
University of Leyden
Boerhaavelaan 2
2334 EN Leyden
THE NETHERLANDS

1 Dr. Fritz Drasgow
Yale School of Organization and
Management
Yale University
Box 1A
New Haven, CT 06520

1 LCOL J. C. Eggenberger
Directorate of Personnel
Applied Research
National Defence Hq.
101 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, KIA 0K2
CANADA

1 Dr. Benjamin A. Fairbank, Jr.
McFann-Gray and Associates, Inc.
5825 Callaghan
Suite 225
San Antonio, TX 78228

1 Dr. Leonard Feldt
Lindquist Center for Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

1 Dr. Richard L. Ferguson
The American College Testing Program
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52240

1 Dr. Victor Fields
Department of Psychology
Montgomery College
Rockville, MD 20850

1 Univ. Prof. Dr. Gerhard Fischer
Psychologisches Institut der
Universitat Wien
Liebiggasse 5/3
A 1010 Wien
AUSTRIA

1 Prof. Donald Fitzgerald
University of New England
Armidale, New South Wales 2351
AUSTRALIA

1 Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman
Advanced Research Resources Organization
Suite 900
4330 East West Highway
Washington, DC 20014

1 Dr. John R. Frederiksen
Bolt, Beranek, and Newman
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

1 Dr. Robert Glaser
LRDC
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

1 Dr. Bert Green
Department of Psychology
Johns Hopkins University
Charles and 34th Streets
Baltimore, MD 21218

1 Dr. Ron Hambleton
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01002

1 Dr. Lloyd Humphreys
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820

1 Library
HumRRO/Western Division
27857 Berwick Drive
Carmel, CA 93921

1 Dr. Steven Hunka
Department of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
CANADA

1 Dr. Earl Hunt
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98105

1 Dr. Jack Hunter
2122 Coolidge Street
Lansing, MI 48906

1 Dr. Huynh Huynh
College of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

1 Mr. Marlin Kroger
1117 Via Goleta
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

1 Dr. Michael Levine
Department of Educational Psychology
210 Education Building
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61801

1 Dr. Charles Lewis
Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
Oude Boteringestraat 23
9712GC Groningen
NETHERLANDS

1 Dr. Robert Linn
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

1 Dr. James Lumsden
Department of Psychology
University of Western Australia
Nedlands, Western Australia 6009
AUSTRALIA

1 Dr. Gary Marco
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

1 Dr. Scott Maxwell
Department of Psychology
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77004

1 Dr. Samuel T. Mayo
Loyola University of Chicago
820 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611

1 Dr. Allen Munro
Behavioral Technology Laboratories
1845 Elena Avenue
Fourth Floor
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

1 Dr. Melvin R. Novick
356 Lindquist Center for Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

1 Dr. Jesse Orlansky
Institute for Defense Analyses
400 Army Navy Drive
Arlington, VA 22202

1 Dr. Wayne M. Patience
American Council on Education
GED Testing Service, Suite 20
One Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036

1 Dr. James A. Paulson
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo
2431 North Edgewood Street
Arlington, VA 22207

1 Dr. Diane M. Ramsey-Klee
R-K Research and System Design
3947 Ridgemont Drive
Malibu, CA 90265

1 Mr. Minrat M. L. Rauch
P II 4
Bundesministerium der Verteidigung
Postfach 1328
D-53 Bonn 1
GERMANY

1 Dr. Mark D. Reckase
Educational Psychology Department
University of Missouri-Columbia
4 Hill Hall
Columbia, MO 65211

1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman
Department of Psychology
Montgomery College
Rockville, MD 20850

1 Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf
Bell Laboratories
600 Mountain Avenue
Murray Hill, NJ 07974

1 Dr. Lawrence Rudner
403 Elm Avenue
Takoma Park, MD 20012

1 Dr. J. Ryan
Department of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

1 Prof. Fumiko Samejima
Department of Psychology
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37916

1 Dr. Frank L. Schmidt
Ddepartment of Psychology
Building GG
George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052

1 Dr. Robert J. Seidel
Instructional Technology Group
HumRRO
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

1 Committee on Cognitive Research
c/o Dr. Lonnie R. Sherrod
Social Science Research Council
605 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10016

1 Dr. Kazuo Shigemasu
University of Tohoku
Department of Educational Psychology
Kawauchi, Sendai 980
JAPAN

1 Dr. Edwin Shirkey
Department of Psychology
University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL 32816

1 Dr. Richard Snow
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

1 Dr. Robert Sternberg
Department of Psychology
Yale University
Box 11A, Yale Station
New Haven, CT 06520

1 Dr. Albert Stevens
Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, Inc.
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

1 Dr. Hariharan Swaminathan
Laboratory of Psychometric and
Evaluation Research
School of Education
University of Massacuusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

1 Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka
Computer Based Education Research
Laboratory
252 Engineering Research Laboratory
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

1 Dr. David Thissen
Department of Psychology
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66044

1 Dr. Robert Tsutakawa
Department of Statistics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65201

1 Dr. David Vale
Assessment Systems
Corporation
2395 University Avenue
Suite 306
St. Paul, MN 55114

1 Dr. Howard Wainer
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

1 Dr. Thomas Wallsten
Psychometric Laboratory
Davie Hall 013A
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

1 Dr. Phyllis Weaver
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
200 Larsen Hall, Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

1 Dr. David J. Weiss
N660 Elliott Hall
University of Minnesota
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455

1 Dr. Susan E. Whitely
Psychology Department
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66044

1 Dr. Wolfgang Wildgrube
Streitkraefteamt
Box 20 50 03
D-5300 Bonn 2
WEST GERMANY